

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 2

for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 8-19 and 21-33 are pending in the application. Claim 30 has been objected to. Claims 8-19, 21-29 and 31-33 have been rejected. No claims have been amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claim 30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants argue herein for the allowability of the base claims and thus, claim 30 has not been rewritten.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 11-17, 19, 22-29 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sawada (US Patent 5,754,430).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Moreover, Applicants strongly disagree with Examiner's statement:

"While Applicants argue the claimed apparatus is different than Sawada in that Sawada's apparatus is not a 'one-piece' apparatus, it is the Examiner's position that the mere fact that a given structure is integral does not preclude its consisting of various elements. As defined in the Webster's New International Dictionary (2nd Ed.) defines 'integral' as 'constituent parts that are so combined as to constitute a unitary whole'." (Office Action, page 3, second full paragraph)

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 3

Sawada does not teach two different units working together, but two different embodiments for his destination setting means 4 and place name input means 5. That is, Figs. 3 and Fig. 4. As stated in col. 8, lines 31 – 34:

"FIG. 4 is a block diagram showing **another** embodiment of the destination setting means and the place-name input means." (emphasis added).

He further indicates that these are alternative embodiments in col. 12, lines 47 – 52:

"When the route judgement means 76 receives a signal 47d representing that place name or the like input by voice **or** handwrite cannot be recognized, from destination setting means 4 and the place name input means 5 constructed by the voice recognition device 40 **or** the handwrite character recognition device 56 ..." (emphasis added).

These quotations indicate that Sawada considers these two types of input as alternatives and not as two different inputs to a control unit. Sawada thus does not teach "a control unit able to receive said at least first command and at least one second command", as recited in claim 25. Nor does Sawada teach "controlling at least one appliance within a vehicle with at least one signal generated from recognition of voice and handwritten input" as recited in claim 33 since Sawada uses either voice or handwritten input but not both.

Thus, the Examiner's statement is incorrect and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 9, 11-17, 19, 22-29 and 33.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 18, 21, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Sawada (US Patent 5,754,430) in view of Obradovich (US Patent 6,282,464).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The combination of Sawada and Obradovich does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 25 or 33, nor does it teach or suggest all the limitations of dependent claims 10, 18, 21, 31 and 32. Sawada has been discussed above. That discussion is applicable here. Obradovich is also silent as to "a control unit able to receive said at least first command

APPLICANTS: ILAN, Gabriel et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 4

and at least one second command", as recited in claim 25. Nor does Sawada teach "controlling at least one appliance within a vehicle with at least one signal generated from recognition of voice and handwritten input" as recited in claim 33 and therefore cannot cure the deficiencies of Sawada. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 05-0649.

Respectfully submitted,


Vladimir Sherman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,116

Dated: May 30, 2002

Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen-Zedek
One Crystal Park, Suite 210, 2011 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA, USA 22202-3709
Telephone: (703) 486-0600
Fax: (703) 486-0800